



ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES



Superintendent
of Documents

LIBRARY PROGRAMS SERVICE

Vol. 8, no. 8

GP 3.16/3-2:8/8

April 1987

1987 BIENNIAL SURVEY

The 1987 Biennial Survey was distributed to all libraries during the last week of March. The Survey was sent first class mail and should have arrived at your library during the first week of April. If you have not received the 1987 Biennial Survey, please call GPO at (202) 275-1119 and a copy will be rushed to you. You could also obtain a photocopy of the Survey and answer sheets by contacting your Regional Library.

ALL depositories must return the Biennial Survey answer sheets to GPO by May 31, 1987.

CLAIMS

LPS is aware that some depository libraries have experienced continuous problems with non-receipt of materials to which they were entitled. In an effort to identify the cause of these problems, and to effect solutions, LPS will conduct a six-month study of shipments to those libraries that submit 20 or more legitimate claims to this office during any thirty day period.

We request that you notify Carl B. Redd, Chief, Depository Processing Branch (202-275-1007) or Colleen Davis, Chief, Depository Mailing Branch (202-275-1006) as soon as you realize that you are having to claim 20 or more publications a month. You may also write to Mr. Redd or Ms. Davis at:
U.S. Government Printing Office
Library Programs Service (Stop SLD)
Washington, D.C. 20401

It is the responsibility of each library to keep track of how many claims per month it is submitting and to notify LPS when the number reaches or exceeds 20. Your prompt attention to this matter will greatly enhance our efforts to further reduce the number of claims submitted by depository libraries.

CLASSIFICATION HOTLINE

The classification hotline remains a good avenue for communication between depository libraries and LPS when there are questions on SuDocs classification numbers. The hotline was established expressly for queries on current numbers, i.e., those issued within the current two-month period. Questions on numbers assigned to older materials should be sent in on the inquiry forms (please use the newer forms with LPS's current address). To use the hotline, phone (202) 275-1131 and identify your call as a hotline call.

MORE ON TOWER COMMISSION REPORT

LPS has received the following kudos from depository librarians who appreciated the despatch with which LPS handled the Tower Commission report:

On a cheerful card from Nancy Eldblom, Documents Librarian, SUNY/Potsdam: "Thanks ... a million! for getting the Tower Commission report out so promptly!"

and from Anne Diamond, Library Administrator, Government Documents Service, Library of Michigan: "Dear Don [Fossedal]: Thank you for the timely distribution of the Report of the President's Special Review Board (Tower Commission). The report arrived in depository shipments which we received during the day of President Reagan's evening address. We were able to respond immediately to requests for the document. Patrons expressed pleasure at our ability to give them what they wanted, when they wanted it. We greatly appreciate your assistance."

Thank you for taking the time to write!

The Reader's Exchange Column, instituted in April 1986 in Administrative Notes, has proven to be a success. Libraries have assisted each other in a variety of ways by exchanging some excellent ideas. However in recent months submissions to the Reader's Exchange Column have slowed. This notice is to reiterate and reaffirm LPS's commitment to this important addition to Administrative Notes. As was initially stated in Administrative Notes, vol. 7, no. 6, p. 1, of April 1986, the purpose of the Reader's Exchange is "to provide for library workers to exchange ideas, information, and techniques for improving depository library operations or service to the public. . . . to share good ideas that have been found to work in depository libraries."

Again, ". . . submit articles for the Reader's Exchange Column in typed reproducible copy on standard 8 1/2 x 11" white paper (camera ready). An article should not exceed two pages in length. GPO reserves the right to return articles that do not comport with the purpose of the Reader's Exchange Column and with the Instructions to Depository Libraries or with prevailing policies or guidelines. Submit articles to :

Chief, Inspection Team
U. S. Government Printing Office
Library Programs Service (SLL)
Washington, D.C. 20401

Some suggested topics are:

1. How are libraries promoting their depository status and collections beyond their primary patrons (i.e. students) and into the community and U.S. Congressional District?
2. How are relatively small academic and small public library depositories ascertaining the government information needs of the general public, and how are they developing their collections accordingly?
3. How are depositories in a U.S. Congressional District or relevant region coordinating item selections so as to insure maximum relevant item coverage and to eliminate needless (not necessary) duplication of selections, among depositories in the aforementioned U.S. Congressional District or region?
4. How are depositories in an area, U.S. Congressional District, region, or state developing union lists and/or networking projects relating to depository materials and services?
5. What actions are state and local GODORTS taking to promote depository materials and service, and interdepository cooperation?
6. How are personal computers (PCs) being used to automate depository operations? (some excellent columns have already been submitted).

Recommendations and Responses

APRIL 1987

San Diego, California

1. The Depository Library Council commends the Public Printer on the preparation, printing, and distribution of the booklet The Designation Procedure for Federal Depository Libraries (GP 3.2:D 44/9 OCLC #13569353).

The Public Printer thanks Council for this commendation. The Designation Procedure for Federal Depository Libraries has served to improve communication between GPO and libraries interested in becoming depositories. In fact, the entire designation process has been revised in an effort to provide interested libraries with a clearer understanding of the designation process and the responsibilities of Federal Depository Libraries.

This latest publication both expands and improves the comprehensive body of documentation that has been developed in recent years for the Depository Library Program. This body of documentation not only promotes understanding of the Program, but also provides a framework for effective management, accountability, and library practice.

2. The Depository Library Council to the Public Printer is pleased that the long-awaited shipping lists for USGS maps have finally come into reality. Council recommends, however, that all depository libraries receive all USGS shipping lists even though they may not receive any maps for those shipments.

Rationale: Council realizes that not all federal depositories select maps. For those that do, it is not possible for the libraries that select maps to determine if they have received all the maps which they have selected.

The USGS provides the following response: LPS and USGS agree on the need to provide shipping lists for USGS maps to all map depository libraries; investigations to determine the most cost effective and efficient method are being conducted. Council should note, however, that since all depository libraries are not necessarily map depository libraries, that the shipping lists will be provided to all map depository libraries.

3. The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that Section 4-5 of the Guidelines for the Depository Library System suggesting that depository libraries select a minimum of 25 percent of available item numbers be deleted. Council further recommends that the Inspection Team be asked to report to Council at the Spring meeting more reasonable criteria based upon their experience.

Rationale: Depository libraries should select only those publications necessary to serve their patrons and their congressional district.

The Public Printer agrees that section 4-5 of the Guidelines for the Depository Library System should be deleted and replaced by a collection development guideline that better comports with the goals of the Depository Library Program.

The Inspection Team recommends that the new guideline read: "Depository Libraries, either solely or in conjunction with neighboring depositories, should make demonstrable efforts to identify and meet the Government information needs of the local area." This guideline together with Section 1 of the Instructions to Depository Libraries and Section 2 of the Federal Depository Library Manual provides a realistic collection development standard for all depositories. A minimum percentage of item number selections will not be required but, based on the item number selections of similar type libraries, inordinately low or high item number selections could affect Inspection Report scoring.

4. The Depository Library Council accepts Option A of the Director, Library Programs Service's memo dated August 22, 1986, regarding distribution of the EEOC Decisions on microfiche. Council recommends that the Public Printer direct the Library Programs Service to pursue the inclusion of the SuDoc class stem in the header of future microfiche editions. Council also suggests that a notice explaining that the EEOC Decisions are being sent directly to selecting libraries from Information Handling Services (IHS) be included in Administrative Notes as well as on a shipping list in advance of the initial distribution.

Rationale: Council weighed the advantages of both IHS- and GPO- produced fiche. Since the IHS fiche could be provided to depositories in a timely manner, it was felt that microfiche distribution by IHS was the best alternative between the two choices offered to Council. Other areas of the library that receive commercially-produced materials may not realize the EEOC Decisions are part of that library's depository shipment. A note in Administrative Notes could lessen confusion about the receipt of this fiche and would decrease letters of inquiry to IHS.

LPS is pursuing the inclusion of microfiche for EEOC's Federal Section in their depository library program. We have transmitted Council's expressed desire that the SuDocs class number appear in the headers to appropriate officials at EEOC. Prior to actual distribution of the hearings, we will advise libraries via Administrative Notes and the Shipping Lists as to the specific arrangements that have been made.

5. The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that all Department of Defense material in the nature of "handbooks, manuals and guides" be microfiched to the fullest extent possible with the exception of the Area Handbooks/Country Studies.

Rationale: The proliferation of DOD publications presents an opportunity for savings in IPS. It was felt that these materials were little used, frequently did not require transmittals, and were excellent candidates for microfiche distribution to depositories.

IPS will review item number/class stems which represent, or include, Department of Defense publications in the nature of "handbooks, manuals, and guides," with the exception of Area Handbooks/Country Studies. We will microfiche these publications to the fullest extent possible, while adhering to guidelines promulgated in SOD 13 regarding physical suitability for microfiching.

6. The Depository Library Council commends the Public Printer for the development of the Executive Information System (EIS) and the Acquisition, Classification and Shipment Information System (ACSIS). However, Council recommends that the Public Printer study enhancement of the DDIS system to allow more selectivity for depository libraries and continue planning for an integrated automated management system for the Library Programs Service, which would be a part of or interface with other GPO systems.

Rationale: An enhanced DDIS or similar system will allow the Library Programs Service to secure substantial savings resulting from more accurate selection of items to meet the patron needs of individual libraries. An integrated automated management system will help the Library Programs Service be more efficient in meeting its statutory mission and to communicate with other GPO functional areas.

The Public Printer thanks the Council for its support of the Executive Information System (EIS) and the Acquisition, Classification and Shipment Information System (ACSIS).

The DDIS system has recently been converted from an ISAM (Indexed Sequential Access Method)

to a VSAM (Virtual Storage Access Method) file structure. While the enhancement has resulted in improved query response time, it does not enable us to add additional item numbers significantly over and above what is already being added as a result of routine surveys, and small scale special efforts such as breaking out the top 20 problem item numbers. The problem is not with the quantity of item numbers per se (the item file), but with the resultant size of the selection file, which contains one record for each unique combination of library number and item number. The size of the selection file increases rapidly with the addition of each new item number; e.g., the addition of 368 new item numbers in FY 86 (assuming an average selection count of 425) resulted in approximately 156,400 new records being added to an already massive file.

Data Systems Service has examined various approaches to breaking the selection file into smaller files, and has concluded that splitting the files offers no solution. The solution lies in converting the DDIS system to a database environment.

GPO is currently evaluating database management systems for applicability to GPO system requirements, specifically including Superintendent of Documents requirements. We anticipate eventually converting DDIS to a database management system. Once this is accomplished, the capabilities/capacity of the DDIS system itself will no longer be an obstacle to adding additional item numbers.

7. The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that he seek changes to Title 44 U.S. Code and/or reconsider previous GPO interpretations in order to allow Regional Libraries to have more flexibility in assuring the maintenance of a complete depository collection available to the region's library communities.

Rationale: Regionals are facing crippling space problems due to the permanent retention requirements in Title 44 and in the literal interpretations of that Title by GPO Legal Counsel.

General Counsel provides the following response to the Director, Library Programs Service:

BACKGROUND

In your memorandum seeking our advice with respect to this recommendation, you explain that while regional libraries are required to receive and retain one copy of all publications sent through the depository system, in certain cases the regionals can designate selective depository libraries within the area they serve to receive and house segregable portions of the depository collection.¹

According to your memorandum, the library designated to receive these documents is acting as the regional's agent, but the regional remains responsible for the integrity of the depository collection and adherence to the regulations of the Superintendent of Documents.

Your view is that LPS would not necessarily oppose satellite housing of portions of the regional depository collections - indeed, you assert that it may serve to reduce the number of duplicate publications in the depository library system.

DISCUSSION

Recommendation No. 7 does not indicate what changes the DLC believes the Public Printer should seek to Title 44. Without a specific legislative proposal to review, we are unable to offer our views with respect to the advisability of any legislative changes.

¹Specifically, you note that special arrangements are already in place for the separate housing of United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps and Department of Energy Technical Information Center Reports (DOE/TIC Reports).

We observe also that neither the recommendation nor the "Rationale" identifies the interpretations of this office which are restricting the regionals' "flexibility" in maintaining their collections. So far as we can determine, the only opinion of the Office of General Counsel (OGC) that may be causing concern for the regional librarians was the one issued on April 6, 1982, entitled "Depository Libraries, Regional - Selection and Discard Policies." (Copy attached.) In that opinion, we concluded that regional depository libraries could not selectively choose Government documents for their collections, nor could they discard documents except as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents when superseded or later issued in bound form. We have reviewed that decision and the language of the relevant statutory provisions and discern no reason for us to alter that prior opinion.

In the course of our review of this issue, we have discovered that this office has already rendered a number of opinions which recognize LPS' authority in providing regionals with some flexibility in maintaining their collections, including satellite housing of the regionals' collections. For example, in an opinion entitled "Documents - Joint Regional Depository Libraries" dated January 9, 1975, we stated that there would be

no objection were the regional libraries to make arrangements with another depository library for housing part of the collection as long as the criteria set forth in Title 44 are met and it is clear that primary responsibility rests with the designated regional library.

More recently, in at least three separate situations, OGC has reviewed plans submitted by regional libraries which would provide for shared responsibility for maintenance of

the depository library collection.² This office did not object to these plans even though an entire regional depository collection would not be physically housed in one location. Finally, we were involved in reviewing and approving the USGC maps and DOE/TIC Report distribution plans.

Based on our informal discussions with you regarding this issue, we believe the more critical problems for LPS may be operational. As we note above, it remains a requirement, with certain narrow exceptions, that the regional depository library receive and retain a copy of all documents distributed by LPS. Also, the regional has an obligation to make that collection accessible to the public. 44 U.S.C. §§ 1911, 1912. It may be that as the administrator of the depository library program, you will want to impose limits on shipping points (e.g., that a regional depository receive all publications and that it be responsible for any further distribution), to impose record-keeping conditions on a regional with satellite housing, or to establish the minimum measure(s) of accessibility by the public to the collection.³ Obviously, we offer here only legal counsel and therefore leave these programmatic decisions to your discretion.

²These cooperative arrangements were or are between the Thomas Jefferson Library, St. Louis University of Missouri at St. Louis, and Southwest Missouri State University Library, Springfield, Missouri; the Nebraska Library Commission and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries; the Robert Muldrow Cooper Library, Clemson University, the Thomas Cooper Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina and the Ida Jane Dacus Library, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

³As an example, you might decide to require that a patron of a regional be able to obtain any document in the system within "X" weeks, days or hours. We believe you have the authority to issue such regulations. However, should there be any doubt as to the propriety of a proposed regulation, you may seek the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. See 44 U.S.C. § 1914. Assuming such approval is granted, the regulation would be binding on all depository libraries with regional status.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OPINION OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES, REGIONAL - SELECTION AND DISCARD POLICIES

Opinion

Chapter 19 of Title 44 does not permit the regional depository libraries to selectively choose available Government publications or to selectively discard Government publications unless authorized by the Superintendent of Documents pursuant to 44 U.S.C.#1911.

Facts

At its Spring 1981 meeting, the Depository Library Council passed a resolution recommending that the GPO seek authorization from the Joint Committee on Printing to permit regional depository libraries to selectively choose certain publications that are developed on a geographical basis (i.e. Flood Insurance Studies, Soil Surveys). The Office of the Superintendent of Documents referred the matter to the General Counsel's Office for comment with the further request that this office address the issue of selective discarding of publications by the regional depository libraries.

As the depository system now functions, regionals must accept into their Government publications collection all documents made available by the GPO either in printed format or in microfilm. They must also retain all of these documents unless directed to do otherwise by the Superintendent of Documents. Depository libraries, on the other hand, can selectively choose which documents they would like to obtain and may discard them after five years. Under this system the depository should be able to obtain any document not in its own collection from a state regional by inter-library loan. However, pursuant to this resolution these regional libraries would in the future like to be able to selectively choose certain geographic material relevant only to their particular region and discard publications no longer relevant, topical or in demand in order to better manage the limited space available to them.

Discussion

The regional depository library was a creation of the Depository Library Act of 1962, Pub. L. 87-579, 76 Stat. 352. Prior to this legislation, there were no regional libraries and all depository libraries were required to maintain their Government collections indefinitely. This onerous requirement apparently influenced many libraries to curtail their requests

of materials. To alleviate this problem, in its overhaul of the depository system, Congress enacted 44 U.S.C. #1912. This provision deals with the establishment of regional depositories and reads in part as follows:

"Not more than two depository libraries in each State and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may be designated as regional depositories, and shall receive from the Superintendent of Documents copies of all new and revised Government publications authorized for distribution to depository libraries. . . . that the (regional) library will, in addition to fulfilling the requirements for depository libraries, retain at least one copy of all Government publications either in printed or microfacsimile form (except those authorized to be discarded by the Superintendent of Documents); and within the region served will provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance for depository libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publication" (Emphasis added.)

The intent of this language is clearly evident in the Senate Report which accompanied H.R. 8141 which was later enacted as the Depository Library Act. Congress' unambiguous intention was that these regional libraries would have to accept and retain all Government publications made available to the depositories. Complete document collections would be accessible to all regular depositories within a State. S. Rep. No. 1587, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., pp.9, 13-14, 23 (1962). This revision, therefore, permitted individual depository libraries to discard unwanted documents, while at the same time, ensure that all Government publications would remain available and accessible to all interested parties through the regional depository libraries.

Since, Congress intended that the regionals were to maintain a complete collection of Government publications, the regionals are prohibited from discarding any documents except as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents. This prohibition is set out in 44 U.S.C. #1911 which reads as follows:

"Depository libraries shall make Government publications available for the free use of the general public, and may dispose of them after retention for five years under section 1912 of this title, if the depository libraries not served by a regional depository library, or that are regional depository libraries themselves, shall retain Government publications permanently in either printed form or in microfacsimile form, except superseded publications or those issued later in bound form which may be discarded as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents. (Emphasis added.)

It appears that regional depository libraries must receive copies of all Government publications regardless of the geographic nature of the publications and must retain these collections permanently. It has been suggested that 44 U.S.C §1914 be used to permit circumvention of these legal obligations. The section empowers the Public Printer to use any measures to implement Chapter 19 with the JCP's approval. However, since all of these provisions must be construed together in harmony, this section cannot be used to violate Sections 1911 and 1912.

Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the regional depository libraries cannot selectively choose documents for their collections and they cannot discard documents except when superseded or issued later in bound form.



GARRETT E. BROWN, JR.

APR 16 1982

8. Council has identified several actions which, if implemented, could substantially enhance the effectiveness and economies of LPS and/or prove beneficial to the depository library community. Council has divided the recommendations into Group 1, those which could be put into effect immediately, and Group 2, those which would require additional time. The following are recommended to the Public Printer.

Group 1

- 8.1a.) Publish a list of Depository Study Group members in Administrative Notes.

The list of Depository Study Group members will be published in an upcoming issue of Administrative Notes.

- 8.1b.) Publish announcements from the Association of Research Libraries/Office of Management Studies on management seminars available to depository librarians in Administrative Notes.

Three announcements from ARL/OMS regarding their management workshops have been published in Administrative Notes: in Vol. 8, no. 1, p. 5; in Vol. 8, no. 3, pg. 11; and in Vol. 8, no. 6, p. 7. We will continue to publish information about the ARL/OMS Workshops as we receive it.

- 8.1c.) Publish the "Preliminary Draft (October 1986) Guidelines on Provision of Government Publications to Depository Libraries" in Administrative Notes. This will allow for maximum input by the depository community.

The Preliminary Draft (October 1986) "Guidelines on Provision of Government Publications to Depository Libraries" was superseded by a March 1987 version, which has been provided to members of the Depository Library Council.

Staff of the Joint Committee on Printing anticipate publishing the March 1987 version of the guidelines in an upcoming issue of Administrative Notes.

- 8.1d.) Cease any further classification separation of serial titles within series for the following : a) serial titles based on geography (e.g., County Business Patterns), and b) serial titles composed of chapters or parts (e.g., Medicare Intermediary Manual). Diane Smith has volunteered to answer questions on this recommendation.

The establishment of individual serial classes for titles based on geography has been largely completed for existing serial titles. LPS has only established individual classes for publications issued in chapters or parts in very limited circumstances. This application is only used for titles which have a very complex or confusing pattern of issuance, and is considered a "last resort" classification. The Council may be assured that this practice is only used after thorough review and the elimination of all other possibilities. These processes have been conducted in accordance with the publicized GPO classification principles and are of vital importance in the future automation of the GPO classification shelf list. Every new class or reclassification action taken at LPS is reviewed by a Classification and Cataloging Branch supervisor for accuracy and consistency with the guidelines. The reclassification of serial titles is a policy change that was not undertaken lightly, one in which certain short-term inconveniences are necessary in order to achieve a long-term improvement in the system. LPS feels it would be counterproductive to reverse this policy after so much work has been completed.

- 8.1e.) Make an exception to GPO's policy of separating out serial titles as the publications are processed, when the next issues of the serial title to be changed comes in the middle of a volume or calendar year. Diane Smith has volunteered to answer questions on this recommendation.

As stated in the response to a similar recommendation from the Spring 1986 Council meeting, it has been LPS' experience that introducing procedural exceptions in the classification process impedes the workflow and results in increased errors. During FY 1986 LPS has expended a great deal of effort in improving the classification process, by establishing a peer review quality control procedure, increasing the timeliness of classification, and in improving the responsiveness to user inquiries. These efforts

required a major commitment of personnel resources, and with the continuing heavy workload in classification it is simply not feasible to make an exception to implementing new classes as the publications are processed.

Again, as in Recommendation 8.1d, the reclassification of serial titles that occurred within series is a process that has been largely completed, and libraries have already felt the bulk of the impact. To reverse this policy at this late date would be counterproductive and confusing, while slowing LPS processing and very likely increasing errors.

- 8.1.f) Ask that the Congressional Serial Set Supplement to the Monthly Catalog not be included in the cumulative indexes for the Monthly Catalog and that the entry numbers not be in the range of other Monthly Catalog entries. Should this be done, the individual reports and documents would not be indexed twice within the cumulative Monthly Catalog indexes. Susan Tulis has volunteered to answer questions on this recommendation.

The Joint Committee on Printing has advised LPS that the Serial Set Committee will be convened later this Spring to consider these and other recommendations concerning the format of the Congressional Serial Set Supplement to the Monthly Catalog. Initial indications are that the Serial Set Committee will look favorably on the Council recommendations concerning the catalog entry numbers and indexing.

- 8.1g.) Secure the inclusion of the various EPA Technical Reports Series in the Depository Library Report. (Item 431-I-11, 431-I-12, EP 1.23/3, 431-J-13 inactive since 1983, 431-I-24, 431-J-11, 431-I-62, 431-K-12 + 431-J). Recently, only selected report summaries have been distributed.

Library Programs Service will work with the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that EPA publications falling into the item numbers cited in the Council's recommendation are distributed through the depository library program.

- 8.1h.) Ask that information regarding the use and availability of map indexes be included in the Federal Depository Library Manual. Kathleen Eisenbeis has agreed to work with the Library Programs Service on this project.

GPO has contacted Ms. Kathleen Eisenbeis concerning the updating of Section 7 of the Federal Depository Library Manual. The Chief, Inspection Team has agreed to work with Ms. Eisenbeis this summer on revising Section 7. After this section is revised, it will be distributed as part of the next transmittal of the Federal Depository Library Manual.

- 8.1i.) Split up the problem item numbers identified in the recent Library Programs Service survey.

As announced in the January 1987 issue of Administrative Notes (Vol. 8, No. 3), LPS will be splitting out the top 20 problem item numbers identified through responses to the questionnaire which appeared in the December 1985 issue of Ad Notes (Vol. 6, No. 18).

Group 2

- 8.2a.) Commend the Library Programs Service on getting the working paper collection shelved. However, we ask that a high priority be given to file the microfiche collection. We also recommend that a concerted effort be made to make the classification corrections to both the microfiche and the paper collection.

Acting on an earlier Council recommendation, LPS staff shelved the working paper collection of documents listed in the 1986 Monthly Catalog. This task was completed in September, and LPS thanks Council for its recognition of this achievement. LPS is also pleased to announce that the filing of the microfiche diazo collection in classification number sequence was completed in early December 1986.

- 8.2b.) Seek General Counsel's guidance on whether or not LPS needs to fill rainchecks for those publications which are or have been superseded.

The General Counsel has provided the following response to the Director, Library Programs Service:

Based on a review of the statutes involved, and discussions with you and Mrs. Trivizas, our impression is that the DLC request poses an operational, rather than legal program.

Section 1904 of Title 44 requires the Superintendent of Documents to issue a list of Government publications

To facilitate the selection of only those publications needed by depository libraries. The selected publications shall be distributed to the depository libraries in accordance with regulations of the Superintendent of Documents, as long as they fulfill the conditions provided by law.

Section 1905, in turn, provides that "Government publications selected from lists prepared by the Superintendent of Documents, and when requested from him, shall be distributed to depository libraries...." 44 U.S.C. § 1905. Accordingly, it is clear that the Superintendent of Documents has an obligation both to prepare lists which enable the depository libraries to select the publications they desire, and to distribute the documents selected.

It is likely that the DLC's request is prompted by the language of 44 U.S.C. § 1911, which, in general, requires depository libraries to retain all publications for a period of five years, "except superseded publications or those issued later in bound form which may be discarded as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents." The DLC recommendation suggests implicitly that cost savings may be possible if LPS is not required to backfill rainchecks issued to depository libraries for publications which were not distributed in the first place, and which, through the passage of time, have become superseded.

Simply stated (from our perspective), any depository library has the right to receive a copy of a publication that it has selected. Concomitantly, LPS has an obligation to fill the orders from the libraries for that publication. As we understand it, once LPS becomes aware that there is a shortage of a particular document which prevents complete distribution to all selecting libraries, it makes various efforts to obtain sufficient copies from other sources. If those efforts prove unavailing, LPS must submit a print order to satisfy the shortage. Because LPS has no direct control over how much time it may take for a particular document to be reprinted, it can not know whether it will have the documents before it is superseded.¹ Additionally, there very well may be selecting libraries which wish to receive and retain copies of a particular document even though it has been superseded. Obviously, as we have noted above, those libraries still would have the right to receive copies of the document, albeit on a delayed basis, because they had selected them initially.

If it were feasible and economical from an operational standpoint, we would have no legal objection to a system which would permit a selecting library to choose not to receive a publication that had become superseded. From the information you have provided to us, it appears that even if such a system could be designed, it would not result in significant cost-savings because the printing requirement would have already been established and the document either would have been printed, or the order may have been processed to the point where it would be impossible to alter the quantity requested. Thus, all that would be saved is some marginal distribution and shipping costs.

¹We note also that the publishing entity, and not LPS, has control over whether and how quickly a document becomes superseded.

We would be happy to discuss this with you further if you believe the situation warrants.

- 8.2c.) Produce a microfiche edition of the 1985 indexes to the daily edition of the Congressional Record (vol. 131), for distribution to depository libraries. It appears that a substantial number of libraries have not received all the issues of this volume.

The Superintendent, Congressional Printing Management Division has responded to this recommendation as follows:

"Suggestion 8.2c. has precedent: I would suggest we go ahead with it. I would also suggest that before preceding you check with the Chief Indexer, Carl Hebert, 275-9020, concerning where the files reside, and the amount of man-hours necessary to produce the desired product."

- 8.2d.) Produce an inverted List of Classes, i.e., a list of item numbers with corresponding SuDocs numbers, titles, frequency and format. Susan Tulis has volunteered to work with LPS on this.

LPS concurs with the intent of this recommendation, to provide item number-to-class stem access to the List of Classes. The arrangement of both the Union List of Item Selections and the item cards is by item number, providing the item number-to-class stem access Council is seeking, and the existence of these two tools was the basis for our inability to support a previous recommendation of Council (Spring 86, #12, Group II). However, we have since reconsidered our previous decision.

In considering the desirability of item number-to-class stem access, we examined three approaches:

- a) A QUARTERLY "FULL" INVERSION IN ADDITION TO THE CURRENT LIST OF CLASSES.

This option consists of a list of item numbers with corresponding SuDoc numbers, titles, frequency, and format, to be published quarterly as a component of the List of Classes. This option would add approximately 140 pages to each issue of the List of

Classes; LPS would incur in excess of \$24,000 annually in additional printing costs.

- b) AN ANNUAL (OR SEMI-ANNUAL) "FULL" INVERSION IN PLACE OF ONE (OR TWO) QUARTERLY EDITION OF THE LIST OF CLASSES

This approach would consist of the same "full" inversion as option A above; however, since issues of the List of Classes in which the arrangement was by item number would replace issues in which the arrangement was by SuDocs class stem, LPS would incur no additional printing costs.

- c) ENHANCEMENT OF THE CURRENT LIST OF CLASSES TO INCLUDE AN INDEX BY ITEM NUMBER

This approach would provide an index arranged by item number. Within each item number only the associated SuDocs class stems would be listed. This "index" option would require the user to refer to the class stem listing for full identification of the entry (and thus does not provide the "one stem lookup" that a full inversion would).

The additional printing costs associated with this option would be minimal.

LPS believes that Option C represents a reasoned balance between cost and utility, and is working with staff of Data Systems Service to provide an item number index to the List of Classes.

9. The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer investigate the possibility of making GPO's OCLC/MARC archival tapes available for sale on a subscription basis through GPO Sales as well as through the Library of Congress.

Rationale: The physical and field changes that the Library of Congress makes to these tapes adds another layer of difficulty to their use by depository libraries, especially those that have tailored their local, online catalogs to use OCLC/MARC tapes rather than USMARC (LC's version). At least 100 libraries have already expressed an interest in the tapes in this format.

The Public Printer has investigated the possibility of making GPO's OCLC/MARC format Monthly Catalog tapes available on a subscription basis. The preliminary estimates are that, in the event such a product would be produced, the annual costs for a subscription consisting of

twelve monthly tapes and one Periodicals Supplement tape would be \$1,153 domestic and \$1,442 foreign.

There would be, of course, a substantial number of technical and procedural details to be resolved before such a product could be offered for sale. Before investing considerable resources in the resolution of these complex issues, GPO wishes to examine the results of the depository library market survey requested by Ms. Sandra McAninch, distributed in Administrative Notes, Vol. 8, No. 5, in order to determine if the potential demand justifies the expenditure of resources.

10. In light of recent developments, the Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer reconsider his General Counsel's opinion on the status of machine-readable files as government information which could be distributed by the GPO. In addition, Council suggests that the Public Printer consider submitting the PRF as a possible JCP pilot project.

Rationale: More and more government agencies are distributing information only in a machine readable format, e.g., BLS diskettes. Consequently, this information is not being made available to depository libraries and the citizens they serve. GPO's participation in the Joint Committee on Printing's pilot projects would seem to be appropriate.

The Public Printer is deferring consideration of PRF as a pilot project, pending Congressional review of the fiscal year 1988 appropriations request by the GPO. The outcome of the budgetary process should provide clear indication of Congressional support for the pilot projects. Meanwhile, PRF continues to be available to the public in microfiche format from GPO, as well as online from commercial sources.

11. The Depository Library Council commends the Library Programs Service for its willingness to experiment with allowing selectives to drop item numbers at any time, not just during the item selection revision period, and recommends that this practice be continued on a permanent basis.

Rationale: It gives selectives more options and saves GPO money by reducing the number of copies which will have to be distributed.

LPS thanks the Depository Library Council for its commendation, and is pleased that the practice of allowing selectives to drop item numbers at any time has proven to be so

beneficial as to warrant continuation. As stated in the June 1986 issue of Administrative Notes (Vol. 7, No. 8), this practice is being tested over a one-year trial period, extending from October 1, 1986, to October 1, 1987. As part of our evaluation, we will certainly consider this endorsement from Council. However, the trial period has only been in effect for 6 months, and we believe that it is premature for LPS to make a permanent commitment at this time.

12. The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service explore the possibility of providing for groups of depository libraries, at their request and for a fee to cover costs, union lists of the item selections of those libraries.

Rationale: Many depositories are now planning to locate cooperative resource sharing. These union lists would encourage cooperation, reduce total item selections, improve regional access, and save money both for depository libraries and for the Library Programs Service.

Reference is made to Vol. 7, No. 20 of the publication, Administrative Notes dated December 1986 (reproduced below), which addresses this recommendation in great detail. There are no plans to offer any other version of this sales item.

GPO DEPOSITORY UNION LIST OF ITEM SELECTIONS Magnetic tape

During the recent meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, held in Washington, D.C., October 15-17, LPS received several inquiries regarding the availability of a machine-readable version of the GPO Union List of Item Selections. GPO does not provide customized sub-sets of the Union List on tape; however, the entire tape is available at a nominal cost for libraries wishing to do their own tape processing. Libraries with the capability to produce customized products from the Union List tapes may wish to consider providing this service to other libraries.

The GPO Depository Union List of Item Selections is comprised of two parts: The first part provides bibliographic and descriptive information for over 6,000 item categories,

which represent United States Government documents distributed through the Federal Depository Program administered by the U.S. Government Printing Office. Each item entry is followed by depository numbers for up to 1,400 libraries which receive that item. An appendix provides complete addresses and telephone numbers for the broad range of public, academic, government, and other special libraries which participate in the Depository Library Program.

The tape sold by this Office is a print image tape used for producing microfiche. It is a high quality nine track tape recorded at 800, 1,600, or 6,250 BPI. Tapes contain IBM standard labels, and 20 records to a block. Each record, which corresponds to a line of print, contains 133 characters for a block size of 2,660 characters.

The price of GPO Depository Union List of Item Selections in magnetic tape format is currently \$183. Like regular sales items, remittance must be money order, or cash, or charged to your VISA, MASTERCARD, GPO OR NTIS deposit account. Please provide the expiration date when using a credit card. Tapes will be duplicated as orders are received, so please allow four to six weeks for delivery. When ordering, please provide the stock number for the union list magnetic tape shown in the Publications Reference File (PRF): 021-000-00115-5. Please send your order to the address below:

Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Chief, Order Division (SSO)
Washington, D.C. 20402

13. The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer prepare and distribute a bi-weekly, cumulative COM index to the daily edition of the Congressional Record in lieu of the current paper product.

Rationale: The change would allow GPO to distribute a more timely, useful, and cheaper index to the Congressional Record rather than that currently available through the sporadic distribution of the bi-weekly paper product.

This recommendation has been referred to the responsible official within the GPO, with a request that a reply be directed to the Chair of Depository Library Council.

15. The Depository Library Council recognizes the present fiscal restraints under which the Library Programs Service must operate. However, the Council refrains from replying to Issue 86-2 (see attached) until a full financial report on savings from current and previous Council recommendations is made. In the interim, Council continues to seek input from the depository community concerning titles and/or item numbers which should always be available in paper.

The Public Printer can appreciate the difficulties inherent in Council's effort to develop a contingency list of 500 items that should always remain in paper, and he is encouraged to know that Council is continuing to seek input from the depository community for purposes of preparing such a list. It is highly unlikely that the list would be needed by GPO prior to September 30, 1987. After that date, however, it would be most helpful if Council were prepared to produce the list on 30-days notice from GPO. Should a need for the list arise and a list is unavailable from Council, GPO would have to proceed unilaterally in selecting more titles for microfiche conversion.

17. The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that at a minimum all regional depository libraries continue to receive both paper and microfiche copies of all publications currently distributed in dual format. The regional depository will ensure the availability of the paper copy for a minimum of five (5) years.

Rationale: The regional will be able to respond to current needs of the selective depositories for paper publications as a response to GPO's budgetary problems.

As long as Regional libraries continue receiving both paper and microfiche copies of all publications currently distributed in dual format, Regionals will only be required to retain one copy of a publication.

18. In addition to the policies expressed in Superintendent of Documents Policy 13 (SOD 13), the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the following factors be considered in determining whether paper or microfiche be sent to depository libraries.
- a. the ability of the GPO to get the "rider" rate;
 - b. the ability of GPO to procure/produce computer output microfiche;
 - c. the ability of GPO to procure competitively high-quality, indexed, enhanced microfiche at no less than current GPO contact specifications.

Rationale: It is expected that all these factors could provide GPO with substantial cost savings.

The Public Printer thanks the DLC for the guidance expressed in recommendation #18, and wishes to assure Council that these considerations will be factored into future decisions on the distribution of hardcopy or microfiche to depositories.

19. The Depository Library Council would like to convey to the Public Printer its support of the Joint Committee on Printing's policy as voiced in their October 3, 1986, letter regarding the depository community's right to choose between paper and microfiche editions of the same publication.

The Public Printer delivered a formal statement on February 23, 1987, before the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee concerning budget estimates for fiscal year 1988. The Public Printer's statement included the following request, "... we have received further direction from the Joint Committee on Printing to continue to provide hard copy publications to libraries that requested them. Because of this, I am requesting that an additional \$1.2 million be derived from the Revolving Fund to fund the additional cost of hard-copy publications." Actual availability of this \$1.2 million in fiscal year 1988 is as yet undetermined.

Research Plan for OTA Assessment of
Technology, Public Policy, and the Changing Nature
of Federal Information Dissemination

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The Office of Technology Assessment is conducting an assessment of "Technology, Public Policy, and the Changing Nature of Federal Information Dissemination." The study was requested by the Joint Committee on Printing and the House Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Government Information, Justice, and Agriculture, and was approved by OTA's Technology Assessment Board in May 1986. A project advisory panel for the study was selected and held its initial meeting in late July 1986.

This document outlines the current research plan for the assessment.

The central focus of the study reflects the primary interests of the requesting congressional committees in the policy implications of advancing electronic technology for the printing and dissemination of Federal information, including implications for the future role of the Government Printing Office and other government agencies with a major role in information dissemination. The emphasis is primarily on information dissemination (defined to include printing of such information), although information collection, maintenance, and processing will be considered where relevant to dissemination. And the focus is principally on Federal information that is public, that is, not subject to Freedom of Information Act exemptions, although privacy, confidentiality, national security, and related issues will be considered where they significantly affect dissemination of public information.

In developing the research plan, the OTA staff recognized the immense complexity of the Federal information arena. In order to provide direction for subsequent research activity, the overall research objectives of the study have been formulated as follows:

1. To provide an understanding of the opportunities and problems presented by advancing electronic technology as applied to printing and dissemination of Federal information by the GPO and other Federal agencies;
2. To develop a picture of how the GPO, other Federal agencies, and the private sector are currently using or planning to use electronic technology and electronic formats as well as paper formats in information dissemination;
3. To develop an understanding of the needs and problems of Federal information users and their current, planned, or desired use of electronic technology, and use of electronic formats compared to paper formats;

4. To identify and analyze a range of institutional and policy options for applying the technology and meeting user needs, including, for example, options for:
- o alternative future roles for the GPO and other major Federal information dissemination agencies;
 - o alternative mechanisms for government-wide management of Federal information;
 - o pricing of Federal information;
 - o role of the private sector in Federal information dissemination;
 - o balancing agency mission, government efficiency, and cost reduction considerations with respect to Federal information dissemination;
 - o balancing public access, open government, and national security considerations with respect to such information;
 - o revisions to relevant public laws (e.g., Public Printing Act, Paperwork Reduction Act).

OTA staff have prepared this research plan with the understanding that the plan will change over time, as new information and analyses become available. Inevitably, as the study progresses, some areas will emerge as warranting higher priority, and others lesser priority, in accordance with their relative importance to congressional policymaking in this arena. Readers are asked to consider the plan from a similar perspective and to remember that plans are made to be continuously reviewed and updated. The OTA staff welcome suggestions on refinements and improvements to the plan. The plan as presented below is divided into five major sections:

- o Congressional Policy Framework
- o Technological Trends and Opportunities for the GPO and Other Federal Agencies
- o Information Collection and Dissemination in the GPO and Other Federal Agencies
- o Implications for Federal Information Users
- o Public Policy Analysis Relevant to the GPO and Other Federal Agencies

CONGRESSIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORK

In their letters of request to OTA, the requesting committees have outlined the congressional policy framework to which this study is addressed.

The JCP requested that OTA conduct a comprehensive assessment that identifies, develops, and analyzes key issues relevant to the future of the GPO and, more generally, to the future of the Federal Government's public information technology and policy. The JCP asked that OTA, in cooperation with the General Accounting Office (GAO) and GPO, assess "the implications of evolving public printing, publishing, and information dissemination technology on the future of GPO and the public information functions of the Federal Government." And the JCP asked that OTA give attention to a broad range of relevant technologies (including printing, data bases, information storage, retrieval, and dissemination) and to major public policy issues, such as:

- o the role of the GPO relative to libraries, Federal executive agencies, and private sector information providers;

- o Federal policies for public access to and dissemination of public information;
- o costs, pricing, and marketing of public information products;
- o opportunities for innovation in public information dissemination and retrieval;
- o omnibus versus targeted public information policy, i.e., government-wide versus specific programmatic areas such as energy, environment, education, health; and
- o role of user training and public and private educational institutions in public information dissemination.

And the Subcommittee on Government Information, Justice, and Agriculture requested that the OTA study include within its scope various issues identified in Subcommittee hearings, such as:

- o public access to agency records;
- o government information and copyright law;
- o user fees for access to Federal information;
- o contracting for electronic information systems;
- o government competition with the private sector information industry; and
- o oversight of Federal electronic information policy.

The Subcommittee on Government Information asked OTA to specifically address:

- o How to improve the ability of the government to collect, maintain, and disseminate information without creating unreasonable restrictions on public access and without undermining existing policies that prevent agencies from copyrighting or otherwise controlling electronic databases;
- o How to establish user fees for information access in an electronic environment that will allocate costs fairly among users and that will not result in hidden subsidization or undesirable restrictions on public access to public information;
- o How to resolve growing conflicts between the government and the private sector in the offering of electronic information services; and
- o How to provide for fair and orderly transitions from public to private maintenance of electronic data bases when the government decides (for policy, budgetary, or other reasons) to stop supporting information activities.

TECHNOLOGICAL TRENDS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE GPO AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

A major thrust of the study is to identify and develop new or evolving ways in which information technology can or might be applied by the GPO and/or other Federal agencies to the dissemination of Federal information, including both advantages and limitations of the technology. As noted earlier, while the focus is on dissemination (defined to include printing), information collection, maintenance, and/or processing will be considered where relevant to dissemination. Also, while the focus is on technologies used for Federal information that is publicly available (that is, not restricted from public

access under one or more Freedom of Information Act exemptions), technologies that handle classified or restricted information may be examined where the technologies are potentially transferrable to unclassified uses.

In order to explore technological trends and opportunities, a representative range of types of Federal information products will be examined, such as:

- o major, full length Federal agency reports;
- o agency pamphlets and short reports;
- o time-sensitive agency announcements and bulletins;
- o statistical data series (data and related analyses);
- o computer models/software;
- o satellite imagery and maps/charts; and
- o governmental process information (e.g., Federal Register);
- o congressional information (e.g., Congressional Record, Senate and House Calendars, committee reports, bills).

For each type of information product, specific examples will be identified for use in further analyses, and relevant technologies and related systems (see below) will be identified and described. Priority will be given to technologies currently on the market and those just coming on the market or likely to do so within 3 to 5 years from now. Secondary consideration will be given to technologies under current research and development and candidates for market introduction 5 to 10 years from now. And brief consideration will be given to technologies still in basic research, but with possible availability 10 to 15 years from now.

To the extent possible, technologies will be examined at the systems level, that is, at the level of the actual application of several technologies used in combination to carry out information functions. Information systems will include various combinations of collection, storage (or maintenance), processing, and dissemination technologies. Illustrative technologies include:

- o collection
 - keyboarding of paper documents
 - typesetting
 - optical character reading of paper documents
 - wordprocessing or microcomputer terminal input
 - electronic data transfer (computer networking)
 - electronic mail or bulletin boards
 - telephone input
- o storage
 - paper files
 - magnetic disk or diskette
 - magnetic tape
 - optical disk
 - compact disk (CD-ROM, CD-I)
- o processing
 - file manipulation

- photocomposition
- statistical software
- analytical software
- computer models
- expert system
- o dissemination
 - conventional printing (e.g., photo offset, xerography) with paper output
 - microform (microfiche, microfilm)
 - electronic printing
 - +paper output
 - +remote printing
 - +printing on demand
 - +desktop publishing
 - electronic mail or bulletin boards (including computer conferencing)
 - electronic data transfer (incl. computer networking)
 - telephone hotline
 - wordprocessing or microcomputer terminal
 - video or computer tape or disk (or diskette)
 - optical or compact disk
 - expert system
 - videotext/teletext
 - broadcast/cable television/radio
 - underlying transmission technologies for above (e.g., cable, microwave, satellite, fiber optic)

For each of the major types of Federal information products, relevant systems and technologies will be identified. Given the large number of possible combination of information products, technologies, and systems, a relatively small number of applications will be selected for more detailed analysis. These applications will include some that already have been pilot tested and applied in the government or private sector and/or are currently in the active planning stage, as well as some applications that appear technically feasible for meeting defined user needs but have not yet been planned or tested.

Illustrative candidate applications for detailed study include:

- o for major, full length Federal agency reports
 - electronic input (via word processing or microcomputer terminals) and transmission to computerized composition and electronic printing systems
 - above with capability to handle graphics and color as well as text
 - electronic output to central or remote locations for printing paper copies with set press run or on demand
 - electronic output via computer diskette or compact disk for electronic viewing and full or selective paper printout as desired
- o for agency pamphlets, short reports, time-sensitive announcements and bulletins, and governmental process information
 - electronic input, transmission, composition, and printing, as above, with central or remote paper output

- electronic output via computer diskette or compact disk
- electronic output via electronic mail, electronic bulletin board, or computer conferencing
- electronic output via cable television, videotext/teletext, or the equivalent
- o for statistical data series and reports
 - electronic data collection via computer, telephone, or electronic mail, including electronic document filing and optical disk storage where applicable
 - electronic data processing, analysis, and manipulation into statistical reporting format
 - electronic printing as above with paper output
 - electronic output via computer tape, diskette, or compact disk
- o for computer models/software
 - electronic input via computer
 - electronic storage on optical disk
 - electronic output via computer tape, diskette, or compact disk

To the extent possible, the major applications will be researched in terms of the following dimensions:

- o approximate cost per unit of output (dissemination cost, storage cost, full cost, etc., ballpark estimate if necessary);
- o economies of scale (as a function of number, size, and type of product, frequency of use or request, etc.);
- o quality of product (readability, durability, accuracy, timeliness, flexibility, etc.);
- o geographic availability (on-site, local, regional, national, etc.);
- o technical limitations, if any (interconnection standards, data communication networking, graphics capability, etc.); and
- o illustrative current and planned applications (from government or private sector), especially innovative and noteworthy applications.

The technical analyses will be based on a combination of: OTA staff research; site visits to selected government and private sector information systems and research and development laboratories; results of other related studies, including a GAO survey of Federal agencies; targeted contract research; and one or more technology workshops. Technical input will be sought from relevant industries, including, for example: computer, telecommunications, information services, printing, publishing, and paper.

Based on the results of this evaluation, technological opportunities (planned or unplanned) for the collection and dissemination of Federal information by GPO and other Federal agencies will be identified. The overall intent of this component of the research plan is to develop a clear picture of the immediate and near-term opportunities and, secondarily, longer-term opportunities opened up by advancing technology, with consideration of both advantages and limitations. Further, the intent is to determine whether and how these opportunities might offer cost, quality, availability, and/or other advantages (or disadvantages) over current systems.

INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION IN THE GPO AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Another thrust of the study is to develop a clear understanding of current and planned Federal information collection and dissemination activities of the GPO and other Federal agencies, with special attention to the role of electronic technology. Resource limitations preclude researching of all 140+ major Federal agency units and tens of thousands of Federal information products. Also, GAO is conducting a Government-wide survey of selected Federal information areas, in coordination with the OTA assessment. Thus the OTA research strategy is to cover a representative sample of agencies and programmatic areas. The sample will be selected to insure that major types of government information (e.g., reports, maps, computer software), programmatic areas (e.g., human resources, natural resources), and user communities (e.g., researchers, trade associations, libraries) are represented.

The sample of Federal agencies will include the GPO, NTIS, Library of Congress, and others drawn from the following list (subject to modification as the study proceeds):

- o Federal agencies with government-wide information functions
 - Government Printing Office
 - National Technical Information Service
 - Library of Congress
 - Consumer Information Center (General Services Administration)
 - National Archives and Records Administration
 - National Bureau of Standards (Commerce)
- o Human resources agencies
 - National Library of Medicine (HHS)
 - National Center for Health Statistics (HHS)
 - ERIC (Education)
 - Social Security Administration (HHS)
 - Food and Drug Administration (HHS)
- o Natural resources/science agencies
 - Dept. of Energy (Office of Scientific and Technical Information, Energy Information Administration)
 - Dept. of Agriculture (National Agricultural Library, etc.)
 - NOAA NEDRES/NESDIS (Commerce)
 - USGS (Interior)
 - NASA
- o Defense agencies
 - Defense Technical Information Center
 - Dept. of the Army (Publications Service)
 - Dept. of the Air Force
 - Defense Communications Agency (Forecasts/JCS)
 - Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
- o Business and commerce agencies
 - Patent and Trademark Office (Commerce)
 - Bureau of the Census (Commerce) and State Data Centers
 - Bureau of Labor Statistics (Labor)

- Internal Revenue Service (Treasury)
- Copyright Office (LOC)
- o Regulatory agencies
 - Securities and Exchange Commission
 - Federal Maritime Commission
 - Environmental Protection Agency
 - Federal Elections Commission
- o Judicial agencies
 - Administrative Office of the Supreme Court
- o Legislative agencies
 - Government Printing Office (also government-wide)
 - Library of Congress (also government-wide)
 - House Information Systems Office
 - Senate Computer Center

Most of the above agencies were initially identified in OTA's 1985 survey of Federal agencies and 1986 report (chap. 7 of Federal Government Information Technology: Management, Security, and Congressional Oversight, February 1986) as having: major Federal information dissemination and/or collection responsibilities; current or planned innovative use of electronic technologies; and/or involvement in significant policy issues concerning use of new technology.

Through site visits, meetings, interviews, the GAO survey results, requests for documents, and other means, including at least one workshop with Federal agency officials, OTA staff will research the following areas of Federal activity:

- o current information collection and dissemination activities
 - statutory requirements
 - other, discretionary information requirements
 - major types of information products (data bases, reports, etc.)
 - technological systems in use for dissemination (and any related collection, maintenance, and processing) of different types of information products
 - distribution of information products (e.g., agency information center or clearinghouse, GPO, NTIS, private firm)
 - pricing of information products, with variations by technology, format, and distribution channel
- o planned information dissemination and collection activities
 - pending or anticipated new statutory requirements for information activities
 - current or projected unmet user needs for agency information
 - current or anticipated cutbacks in information collection and dissemination;
 - pending or anticipated technological changes in information collection and dissemination
 - results of relevant studies and/or pilot projects conducted by or for the agency

- o current and anticipated issues (see policy analysis section for further discussion), such as
 - equity of access to agency information
 - pricing of agency information
 - central agency (e.g., GPO, NTIS) role in agency information dissemination
 - private sector role in agency information dissemination
 - cost-effectiveness of agency information dissemination
 - clearinghouse/bibliographic control of agency information products
 - quality of agency information products
 - archiving of agency information

In sum, this component of the assessment is intended to develop a good understanding of current and evolving Federal information collection and dissemination activities by the GPO and other Federal agencies, current and planned use of electronic technology in this process, and issues that are now or are likely to become significant. The intent is to cover a representative range of Federal missions, types and formats of information products, and technological applications, in order to provide a strong basis for drawing findings and conclusions that are valid for the Federal Government as a whole.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL INFORMATION USERS

Another component of the assessment is an analysis of the needs and perspectives of users of Federal information. The purpose here is to gain an understanding of the extent to which currently perceived needs are being met and how (e.g., via GPO, NTIS, agencies, private firms), problems in meeting those needs (e.g., price, availability, quality), and use of technological systems in meeting those needs (e.g., on-line bibliographic retrieval, microformat, electronic printing on demand), including relative advantages and disadvantages of paper and electronic formats.

The OTA research will include telephone and personal interviews, site visits and meetings with key user groups, selected contracting, and one or more user workshop, plus the results of the GAO user survey.

The analysis will be organized around selected user groups to include, tentatively:

- o library community--defined to include public and private libraries, special, research, and regional, Federal, State, and local, and corporate, that is, the entire library community as both major users and secondary providers of Federal information;
- o press and media--defined to include print media (newspapers, newsletters, periodicals) and electronic media (radio, cable and broadcast television) as major users;
- o large corporations--Fortune 500 companies;
- o small business;
- o scientific and academic research community;

- o public interest and consumer groups;
- o professional and trade associations;
- o the information industry;
- o Federal Government as a user;
- o State/local government;
- o Foreign governments/international organizations;
- o Individuals with special needs (re. handicaps, literacy, language);
- o Individual citizens (e.g., general public, school students).

To the extent possible, OTA staff will seek to develop user group information in categories that are compatible with the technologies and issues considered previously in the Federal agency context.

PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS RELEVANT TO THE GPO AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

This component of the study will build on the results of the technology, Federal agency, and information user analyses discussed previously. The policy analysis will include identification and discussion of policy issues, and identification, development, and evaluation of policy alternatives. Illustrative issues, alternatives, and evaluative dimensions are discussed below.

Illustrative Policy Issues and Alternatives

Federal information access and dissemination policy. Public policy on Federal information access and dissemination is a composite of numerous public laws, regulations, and guidelines. A key policy question concerns to what extent advances in technology, changing user needs, and private sector developments, among other factors, have contributed to conflicting interpretations of and ambiguous definitions in relevant public policy directives or even to significantly outdated public law. A central policy issue, then, is whether and how Congress might clarify and update and possibly even reformulate public policy in ways that address opportunities and problems generated at least in part by electronic technology.

In conducting this analyses and identifying and developing alternatives, it will be important to consider both: (a) the relevant policy history, including prior efforts to amend the Public Printing Act and the legislative history of the Paperwork Reduction Act with respect to information dissemination; and (b) recent developments in the public policy environment, such as efforts to amend and update the Paperwork Reduction Act, changes in JCP rules and guidelines regarding agency printing plans and operations, promulgation of OMB Circular A-130 as it relates to information dissemination, controversies over agency procurement of electronic printing and dissemination systems (and applicability of the Public Printing Act, Brooks Act, and

Competition in Contracting Act), and government efficiency measures such as the Deficit Reduction Act and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act.

Illustrative generic alternatives include:

- status quo;
- revise and update the Public Printing Act, Paperwork Reduction Act, Freedom of Information Act, and other relevant statutes to reflect electronic information dissemination technology;
- develop a clear statement of congressional policy regarding such areas as:
 - ++the government's role in facilitating information access and dissemination,
 - ++pricing of such information,
 - ++use of electronic technology,
 - ++role of the private sector,
 - ++applicability and interpretation of procurement laws and regulations,
 - ++copyright of information prepared by or for government agencies;
- amend existings or enact new law to reflect congressional policy;
- revise JCP regulations and OMB guidelines where necessary to conform to congressional policy;
- revise or reorganize government institutions responsible for information dissemination (see discussion below).

Institutional responsibility for Information dissemination operations.

Operational responsibility in the Federal Government for Federal information dissemination is currently shared among the GPO, NTIS, Libraries of Congress, Medicine, and Agriculture, and numerous agency offices, among others. Outside of the Federal Government, libraries, the press and media, and various private sector information providers, among others, all play a role in Federal information dissemination. A policy question concerns the extent to which advancing technology, changing user needs, and the like are affecting the relative roles of the various institutions and creating new uncertainties or conflicts over institutional responsibilities to the extent that some congressionally-directed institutional changes are needed. An issue here is whether and how Congress might adjust or reorganize the operational roles and responsibilities of relevant Federal agencies with respect to information dissemination.

In conducting this analysis, it will be important to develop an understanding of the historical functions of and relationships between the GPO and other government agencies (e.g., NTIA, Library of Congress) with major responsibilities for information dissemination. With respect to GPO, for example, the analysis will cover the role of GPO as defined in Title 44 (of the U.S. Code), as it relates to other relevant statutes and Federal information dissemination agencies, and as derived from the broad historical and public policy context of Federal information dissemination. The analysis will also summarize where the GPO stands with respect to use of technology, both in terms of its own history and compared to other Federal agencies and to private firms. In addition, the analysis will place current GPO efforts to meet information user needs in context relative to efforts of other Federal agencies, private firms, the media, and so forth, and relative to needs as perceived by the users themselves.

A range of possible alternative institutional arrangements for Federal information dissemination will be identified and evaluated. These institutional alternatives will incorporate possible changes in technology, institutional mandate and structure, and related public policy. Alternative futures for the GPO and other relevant organizations (e.g., Federal agency dissemination units, NTIS, depository libraries) will be incorporated where appropriate. Alternatives will be developed by matching technological opportunities with user needs and various institutional arrangements that could be utilized for implementation, including those in place now and possible changes proposed over the last decade or so.

In developing institutional alternatives, a number of key questions need to be answered, such as:

- o What is the projected mix of Federal information products, e.g., will the need for high-volume, full-length reports in paper format drop significantly? Will the need for electronic data bases continue to increase?
- o What are the likely economies of scale for the projected mix of Federal information products? How are such economies of scale likely to be affected by emergent and long-term technologies compared to current technologies?
- o For what kinds of information products and technologies are centralized, decentralized, and/or hybrid dissemination options likely to be most cost-effective? over what time frame?

The range of institutional alternatives has not yet been fully developed, but consideration will include those that have been previously proposed and new possibilities, including but not limited to the following illustrative alternatives:

--status quo

--accelerated use of electronic technology for information dissemination within the framework of existing institutional arrangements and responsibilities, e.g.,

- ++use of remote printing, printing on demand, and compact disks for dissemination of reports,
- ++use of electronic bulletin boards, electronic mail, and computer conferencing for dissemination of governmental process information,
- ++central agencies (e.g., GPO, NTIS) and other agencies use a full range of technologies where appropriate and consistent with agency missions;

--accelerated use of electronic technology for information dissemination with minor institutional adjustments, e.g.,

- ++electronic dissemination (e.g., via compact disk) of government reports centralized in one agency (e.g., GPO or the equivalent) where cost-effective due to economies of scale,
- ++dissemination of paper reports decentralized where electronic remote printing on demand is cost-effective (e.g., with low volume

documents),

++government-wide responsibility assigned to a central agency for bibliographic control of and electronic clearinghouse/index to location of reports, data bases, models, etc.,

++government-wide responsibility assigned to a central agency for maintenance and updating of electronic data base on key trends information (e.g., organized around the Joint Chiefs of Staff Forecast system),

++variable format information dissemination via depository library program (e.g., paper, microform, diskette, computer tape, compact disk, direct electronic),

++establishment of an innovation center in some existing agency to collect and share learning and expertise about electronic dissemination (and related collection, maintenance, and processing) applications).

--accelerated use of electronic technology with major institutional change, e.g.,

++combination of GPO and NTIS functions,

++combination of GPO, NTIS, and selected functions from other agencies,

++conversion of GPO or a combined agency to independent status,

++GPO responsible for legislative and judicial branch information dissemination, an executive branch entity responsible for executive branch dissemination,

++extend or reorganize the depository library program.

Institutional responsibility for information dissemination policy oversight. In practice, policymaking, operational, and oversight responsibilities regarding Federal information dissemination are closely related and important aspects of overall public policy in this arena. Any changes in legislated policy and/or operational responsibilities could have indirect implications for policy oversight. Or the issue of policy oversight could be addressed directly. A policy question is whether changes in technology, user needs, and concern over governmental efficiency, among other factors, are aggravating and altering the relationships among oversight agencies, or changing the nature of the oversight process itself, to the point where clarification and revision are needed. At present, parts of the policy oversight role are distributed among the OMB, GSA, GPO, NTIS, various other Federal agencies, and various congressional committees (including the JCP, House Committees on Government Operations, Administration, Energy and Commerce, Science and Technology, and Judiciary, and Senate Committees on Rules and Administration, Governmental Affairs, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation, among others). Another policy question is the extent to which centralized management of Federal information procedures, standards, etc. is needed. The analysis here will focus on identifying and evaluating alternatives available to Congress for resolving jurisdictional and other policy oversight questions between and among the branches of government. These alternatives will be related, where appropriate, to the other policy alternatives mentioned earlier.

In conducting this analysis, it will be important to take into account both the history of conflict between the branches of government in this arena (e.g., between the GPO, JCP, and OMB with respect to the applicability of

separation of powers doctrine to policy oversight of Federal information dissemination and electronic printing) and various proposals that have been made to change the policy oversight arrangements (e.g., establishing a congressional Joint Committee on Government Information or the equivalent, reorganizing OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs).

Federal information collection and electronic filing policy. An emerging policy issue concerns the increased use of electronic technology and private contractors in the filing of information with and collection of information by Federal agencies. Since many Federal information products for dissemination are based, at least in part, on information collected or filed, information collection and dissemination can be closely related and affect one another. Several agency pilot projects with electronic filing and automation have already surfaced issues involving contracting, copyright, competitive advantage, and public access. The analysis here will focus on the question of whether emerging issues are covered by existing public laws and the identification, development, and evaluation of possible alternatives for revised or new public law, and other policy actions, if needed.

Illustrative generic alternatives include:

- status quo;
- revise and update the Public Printing Act, Paperwork Reduction Act, Freedom of Information Act, etc. with respect to electronic information collection and filing;
- develop a clear statement of congressional policy regarding electronic collection and filing, regarding such areas as pricing, contracting, copyright, and public access;
- amend existing laws or enact new law to reflect congressional policy;
- revise JCP regulations and OMB guidelines.

Information policies for user groups and individuals with special needs. The technical and information literacy of groups and individuals in American society varies widely. Federal policy has generally recognized that certain groups and individuals have special needs for assistance because of geographic, handicap, literacy, or language barriers. Thus, special Federal programs have been established over the years to assist, for example, rural residents, the deaf and blind (and other seriously handicapped persons), the learning impaired, and the foreign speaking. Many of these Federal programs have been directed to basic educational and infrastructure needs, with some attention to information needs. Estimates of the total populations with special needs (due to geographic, handicap, literacy, or language barriers) vary widely, but appear to be at least in the tens of millions.

Relevant policy questions include: To what extent does electronic Federal information dissemination aggravate existing disparities in information literacy and access? In what ways does electronic technology offer new opportunities to facilitate information access by those with special needs? Are such problems and opportunities within the scope of relevant public laws or are they moving beyond the current policy framework? A policy issue is whether and how Congress might update current public law in this arena.

Illustrative generic policy alternatives include:

- status quo;
- updating general Federal information laws (e.g., FOIA, PRA) with respect to special information needs;
- updating existing Federal laws in relevant programmatic areas (e.g., agriculture, education, social services, libraries) with respect to special information needs;
- assign existing or new information dissemination agencies the responsibility to appropriately apply electronic technology in meeting special information needs;
- direct OMB and/or other policy oversight bodies to promulgate guidelines concerning the use of electronic technology in meeting special information needs.

Evaluation Dimensions

The possible impacts or implications of the major policy alternatives (including combinations of technology, institutional arrangements, and specific policies, where appropriate) such as those illustrated earlier will be evaluated, to the extent possible, in terms of several specific dimensions or areas of impact. The major evaluation dimensions will include, tentatively, the following:

- o equity: What are the implications of the policy alternatives for relative access to Federal information among user groups? For what groups might the policy alternatives improve access? reduce access?
- o agency mission: What are the implications of the policy alternatives for the ability of Federal agencies to carry out statutory missions as they relate to information collection and dissemination? To what extent are currently unmet information needs likely to be better addressed?
- o information quality: To what extent are the policy alternatives likely to affect the quality of Federal information and in what ways (e.g., increase or decrease in accuracy, completeness, timeliness, analytical depth, readability, useability)? Are the policy alternatives likely to generate new opportunities for the protection of the integrity of Federal information and/or create new vulnerabilities to unauthorized use or alteration of such information?
- o open government: What might be the effect of the policy alternatives on the principles of open government, both government information and information about the governmental process, as embodied in the Freedom of Information Act, Public Printing Act, Government in the Sunshine Act, and Paperwork Reduction Act, among others? How might the policy alternatives affect the time and cost of processing FOIA requests, and the number and types of FOIA requests compared to other kinds of requests for Federal information?
- o cost-effectiveness: What might be the effect of the policy alternatives on the cost-effectiveness of Federal information dissemination? on the government's ability to take advantage of opportunities for cost savings and to respond to user needs in more efficient ways? on the cost-effectiveness of the government's procurement

of technological systems?

o private sector role: What are the implications of the policy alternatives for the role(s) of private companies in dissemination (and collection, maintenance, and processing, where relevant) of Federal information? How are the policy alternatives likely to affect the relationships between private firms and the government? the development of the private sector information industry? Are the policy alternatives likely to lead to private firms being increasingly cooperative (e.g., serving as a contractor or value added provider) or competitive (e.g., competing with or challenging the basis for government dissemination of Federal information)? And how might the resultant private sector involvement in turn affect equity of access to Federal information, the ability to agencies to meet user needs, and the cost-effectiveness of Federal information dissemination?

o pricing: What might be the effect of the policy alternatives on pricing of information products? How might this in turn affect equity of access to information, the ability of agencies to carry out statutory missions, and the openness of government?

o institutional responsibility--policy: How are the policy alternatives likely to affect interpretation and implementation of provisions of agency authorizing statutes, Title 44 (e.g., chapter 5), JCP rules and regulations, the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB Circular A-130, etc. relevant to policy oversight of Federal information dissemination? To what extent are the policy alternatives likely to resolve or aggravate areas of ambiguity and conflict?

o institutional responsibility--operations: To what extent are the policy alternatives likely to resolve or aggravate uncertainties or conflicts over the roles of GPO, NTIS, agency units, etc. in Federal information dissemination? uncertainties or conflicts over pricing policy? over the role of private firms?

o clearinghouse/bibliographic control: What are the implications of the policy alternatives for bibliographic control over and indexing of Federal information products? reports? computer models? data bases? What are the likely impacts on current agency and government-wide mechanisms? on private sector mechanisms? on their relative strengths and weaknesses? on their ability to take advantage of new technological systems?

o depository library program: To what extent are the policy alternatives likely to affect participation in and implementation of the depository library program? use of electronic technology in the program? overall effectiveness of depository library dissemination of Federal information?

Where relevant, policy alternatives will also be evaluated, to the extent possible, in terms of the possible impact in other areas, such as:

o national security: What are the implications of the policy alternatives for any national security concerns raised about Federal information dissemination (e.g., more effective dissemination of

unclassified technical information could, in the aggregate, have serious national security implications), and to what extent are these policy alternatives likely to aggravate or mitigate those concerns? To what extent might the policy alternatives affect the implementation of export controls and/or national security/computer security policies regarding sensitive but unclassified Federal information?

o archiving: Are the policy alternatives likely to affect Federal archiving practices, for example, by encouraging more use of electronic formats, and how might definitions and procedures need to be modified as a result?

o copyright: To what extent are the policy alternatives likely to raise new issues or exacerbate old ambiguities with respect to copyrighting of information products produced by or for the Federal Government? copyrighting of information products prepared by government contractors? copyrighting of computer models and software? electronic data bases?

o privacy/confidentiality: Are the policy alternatives likely to affect the protection of personal and proprietary data on which summarized or aggregated public information products are based? Is electronic technology likely to help or hinder such protection?

o transborder data flow: To what extent are the policy alternatives likely to encourage or restrict international dissemination of Federal information and exchange of information with other countries? How might barriers to free flow of public information among nations be lowered or heightened?

Finally, policy alternatives will be analyzed, to the extent possible, for other kinds of impacts that may be identified as important, such as implications for: the size, skills, and training of the Federal labor force; the health and international competitiveness of the electronic printing and related electronic technology industries; Federal-State-local relationships as they relate to information transfer; and the health of the Nation's research and development enterprise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1987 Biennial Survey	p. 1
Upcoming Council Meetings	1
Classification Hotline	2
More on Tower Commission Report	2
Request for Readers Exchange Columns	3
October 1986 Depository Library Recommendations and Responses	4
Draft Research Plan for OTA Assessment of Technology, Public Policy and the Changing Nature of Federal Information Dissemination	27

